

Asheville-Buncombe Historic Resources Commission Meeting
Minutes of August 12, 2015
1st Floor North Conference Room - City Hall
4:00 p.m.

Present: Chair Brendan Ross; David Carpenter, William Eakins, Richard Fast, Bryan Moffitt, David Nutter, Rachel Sudnik, and Joanne Stephenson

Absent: Woodard Farmer, Tracey Rizzo and Amanda Warren

Administrative

- Mr. Eakins moved to approve the minutes of the July 8, 2015, meeting, with minor amendments. This motion was seconded by Mr. Carpenter and carried unanimously.
- All those present in the audience and staff who anticipated speaking were sworn in.
- Mr. Eakins moved to continue the public hearings on Certificates of Appropriateness associated with 181 Flint Street and 230 Pearson Drive until September 9, 2015. This motion was seconded by Mr. Nutter and carried unanimously.

Consent Agenda

1. Certificate of Appropriateness - 129 St. Dunstan's Road - Reconstruction of Existing Front Porch

Owner/Applicant:	Jay Hamilton
Subject Property:	129 St. Dunstan's Road
Hearing Date:	August 12, 2015
Historic District:	St. Dunstan's
PIN:	9648.51-0608
Zoning District:	RS-8

Property Description: One-story Craftsman style bungalow (1920s).

Certificate of Appropriateness Request: That the application is to demolish cracked concrete front porch and rotted framing system and construct new structural footers and flooring system with tile surface of a light gray color to match the original concrete as close as possible, per attached drawings and plans. **All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**

HRC Staff Concerns per the Applicable Guidelines & Submittal Requirements: Staff has no concerns.

That the guidelines for Porches, Entrances and Balconies found on pages 66-67 in the Design Review Guidelines for the St. Dunstan's Historic District, adopted on September 12, 2012, were used to evaluate this request.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends approval for the following reasons: (1) The new porch will be rebuilt to the same size and dimension; and (2) The new tile floor covering will match the existing concrete as close as possible, while reducing the weight of the floor to help maintain the structural integrity of the porch and brick veneer.

ADOPTION OF FINDINGS OF FACT

Based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A -- description of proposed work; Exhibit B -- porch plan and demolition details; Exhibit C -- porch framing sections and details;

Exhibit D – photographs of subject property; and the Commission’s actual inspection and review of subject property by all members, Mr. Moffit moved to adopt the following FINDINGS OF FACT:

1. That notice of public hearing on this application was published in the Asheville Citizen-Times on the 29th day of July, 2015, and that each owner of real property situated within two hundred feet of the subject property was notified of this hearing in the mail on the 29th day of July, 2015 as indicated by Exhibits E and F.
2. That at this hearing the applicant and affected property owners were all given the opportunity to offer oral and documentary evidence as well as submit questions to each other, the Historic Resources Commission staff and Commission members.
3. That the application is to demolish cracked concrete front porch and rotted framing system and construct new structural footers and flooring system with tile surface of a light gray color to match the original concrete as close as possible, per attached drawings and plans. **All necessary permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**
4. That the guidelines for Porches, Entrances and Balconies found on pages 66-67 in the Design Review Guidelines for the St. Dunstan’s Historic District, adopted on September 12, 2012, were used to evaluate this request.
5. This application does meet the design guidelines for the following reasons:
 - a. The new porch will be rebuilt to the same size and dimension.
 - b. The new tile floor covering will match the existing concrete as close as possible, while reducing the weight of the floor to help maintain the structural integrity of the porch and brick veneer.
6. That the action and improvements proposed in the application before us for a Certificate of Appropriateness are congruous with the special historic character of the St. Dunstan’s Historic District.

This motion was seconded by Mr. Eakins and carried unanimously.

As there was no objection to 129 St. Dunstan's Circle Certificate of Appropriateness being placed on the Consent Agenda, the FINDINGS OF FACT were adopted and Certificate of Appropriateness was issued.

Public Hearings

1. Certificate of Appropriateness - Parker-Patton House - Installation of New Surface Parking and Landscaping; Construction of New Accessory Apartment Building

At the request of Mr. Carpenter and Ms. Stephenson (due to a conflict of interest as they both serve on the Board of the Preservation Society), Mr. Nutter moved to recuse Mr. Carpenter and Ms. Stephenson from participating in this issue. This motion was seconded by Mr. Eakins and carried unanimously.

Historic Resources Director Stacy Merten stated that the project is being reviewed concurrently with a conditional zoning application, and that the Commissioners are asked to give feedback in anticipation of final review following City Council’s adoption of the CZ. Because this is a conditional zoning, the Commission cannot vote on whether to issue the Certificate of Appropriateness for the project until after review by the City Council. Following the August HRC review, the project will then go before the Planning & Zoning Commission on September 2, 2015. Ms. Merten requested that the Commission give clear direction on the proposed site plan so that any concerns can be addressed before the Planning & Zoning Commission meeting.

She stated that she had met with the landscape architect, Mr. Mark Wilson, and that she and Mr. Moffitt had also met with the architect, Mr. George Stowe, to help facilitate the design of the project in meeting the Secretary of the Interior Standards. At their informal meeting, Ms. Merten conveyed to Mr. Stowe staff's concern that the revisions that had been made to the design of the proposed accessory building did not reflect the Commission's concerns regarding compatibility of the new structure and that the design was moving farther away from meeting the guidelines. She encouraged Mr. Stowe to go back to the original drawing and focus more on revising the elevation facing Chestnut Street since that was the elevation most Commissioner's had concern with initially. As a result of staff meeting with Mr. Wilson and Mr. Stowe, a revised site plan and elevation drawings of the accessory building are anticipated for further review. Mr. Moffitt explained that they also discussed that modifying the original proposal would more likely be congruous with the design of the main house, than what the more recent design is reflecting.

Using the original site plan, Ms. Merten then reviewed the following staff report:

Owner/Applicant:	95 Charlotte Street, LLC/Jim Siemens
Subject Property:	95 Charlotte Street
Hearing Date:	August 12, 2015
Historic District:	Patton-Parker House, Local Landmark
PIN:	9649.63-1039
Zoning District:	RM-16 – Office CZ

Property Description: The Patton Parker House is a vernacular Victorian era dwelling built in 1868 by Thomas Walton Patton and two African-American carpenters during the economic depression of the Reconstruction era. The Patton-Parker House pre-dates the majority of houses in the Chestnut-Liberty Historic District and its 1.23 acres are the only tangible reminders of a residential estate along the Chestnut and Charlotte Street corridors. The site was also the location of a Civil War encampment and drill grounds used by both Confederate and Union Forces.

Certificate of Appropriateness Request: Rehabilitate structure and site for new use as an office and construct new two-unit apartment building per attached plans and specifications. Work to include the following: Minor modifications of interior floor plans, including relocation of interior door leaf adjacent to entry hall, and addition of three new door leafs on first floor. Removal of case work to open door, modify toilet and relocate steam radiator for creation of ADA compliant facilities. Remove kitchen casework, plumbing and ceiling to reinforce and repair floor above. Exterior alterations include the construction of a circular feature to the existing driveway and additional parking in the front yard, the relocation of bricks from side patio and driveway to construct an accessible entry on the rear of the structure, the construction of surface parking and widening of gravel driveway in the rear yard, removal of six pine trees, two oak trees and 1 dogwood tree from the site and the construction of a 27' x 43', 2, 322 sq. ft. two unit, two-story apartment structure in the rear yard. **All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**

HRC Staff Concerns per the Applicable Guidelines & Submittal Requirements: Staff has met with Mr. Wilson and Mr. Stowe regarding the revised plans and continues to have some concerns with the project. In order for the project to proceed to the Planning & Zoning Commission in September, clear direction is needed from the HRC on the acceptability of the site plan.

Site Plan concerns:

1. Additional trees are proposed to be removed in front of the house for the circular drive.
2. Verify that all trees are correctly identified and located. (ex. poplar to southeast

- corner of house, hemlock vs. spruce). Asked that architect confirm that all trees are correct on the site plan.
3. Revise landscape plan to reflect the historic character of the site (Will require a modification from UDO requirements.).
 4. Parking in rear should be further removed from the back of the house.
 5. Eliminate parking in circular drive in front of the structure (14 minimum per UDO).

Outstanding from previous review:

1. Photograph of casework to be removed in the area around the ADA toilet facilities (confirm receipt)

Accessory Structure: Design team met with Mr. Stowe earlier this week to discuss continued concerns with the design of the new structure. Staff recommended that the applicant try to refine the original design, with emphasis on the Chestnut Street elevation, as that seemed to be the elevation of primary concern based on previous comments.

Secretary of Interior Guidelines and Standards used to evaluate this request:

- Regarding the removal of historic material such as rock or brick walls for driveway, bricks from patio and outbuilding foundation: Removal of the historic material should be avoided per the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, #2 general guidelines.
- Regarding the parking: Recommended: design new on-site parking so that it is as unobtrusive as possible, thus minimizing the effect on the historic character of the setting and preserve the historic relationships between the buildings and the landscape. Not recommended to place parking facilities directly adjacent to historic buildings which cause damage to the historic landscape features, including removal of plant material, or relocation of paths and walkways.
- Regarding the circular driveway and other site features: Identify, retain and preserve buildings and their features as well as site features that are important in defining the overall historic character. Such features can include circulation systems such as walks, paths, roads or parking, vegetation, landforms, furnishings, and subsurface archeological features.
- Regarding the new construction: Design adjacent new construction which is compatible with the historic character of the site and which preserves the historic relationships between the buildings and the landscape. Not recommended to introduce new construction to the site which is visually incompatible in terms of size, scale, design, materials, color and texture; which destroys historic relationships on the site or which destroys important landscape features.

Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation

1. A property shall be used for its historic purpose or be placed in a new use that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment.
2. The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.
3. Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken.
4. Most properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.

5. Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a historic property shall be preserved.
6. Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.
7. Chemical or physical treatments, such as sandblasting, that cause damage to historic materials shall not be used. The surface cleaning of structures, if appropriate, shall be undertaken using the gentlest means possible.
8. Significant archeological resources affected by a project shall be protected and preserved. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures shall be undertaken.
9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.
10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

That Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation were used to evaluate this request with specific reference to Spaces, Features, and Finishes, Building Site, and Setting.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends the HRC continue the application with the consent of the applicant to allow sufficient time for the review process necessary for the Conditional Zoning, but provide specific feedback regarding congruence with the Secretary of Interior Standard's so the applicant can revise the plans as necessary prior to moving forward with their rezoning request. The Project is scheduled for review by the Planning and Zoning Commission on September 2, and should only move forward if the HRC is comfortable with the site plan.

Mr. Jim Siemens, applicant, stressed that parking is very important to him. He currently has a staff of six and envisions increasing that number to 10. If there is a mediation taking place, an additional 5 spaces would be needed to accommodate two attorneys, two litigants and a mediator.

Mr. Moffitt asked Mr. Siemens if he felt it necessary to have 6 parking spaces in the front of the house and 10 in the back or if he simply needed to accommodate 16 total spaces on site and would be flexible with regard to where they were located. Mr. Siemens stated that he took note of Mr. Nutter's comparison of parking on this site with the location of visitor parking at the Smith-McDowell House, and reiterated that he would prefer that his clients be able to park and enter from the front of the house.

Mr. Mark Wilson, landscape architect, discussed the challenge balancing the requirements of the Unified Development Ordinance with the guidelines set forth by the Secretary of Interior Standards with regard to site planning. Mr. Wilson introduced his revised site plan and described the landscaping around the proposed accessory structure. He explained that he had modified the parking area buffer and landscaping at Ms. Merten's request to create a more flowing, less linear plan that is more in keeping with the historic character of the landscape on the site. Using diagrams, he then explained the modification of the proposed circular parking configuration in the front, noting that the entrance from Charlotte Street will be used for ingress only. He discussed the need for the 4 parallel parking spaces on that portion of the one-way loop and explained that the two other parking spaces would be accessed either by making the loop or from the access driveway on Chestnut Street.

Mr. Nutter described the parking layout at the Smith-McDowell House and stated that the cars park half on the grass and half on the gravel. He hoped that the applicant could see some merit in that approach, and that they might consider using mixed surface materials for the perimeter materials to encourage a similar

parking situation. He stated that he understood that providing adequate circulation for cars is a challenge on this historic property but did not want to see this property struggling to find a new use for many years to come. He stated that he believed the landscaping along the front of the property would provide an effective screen.

There was considerable discussion regarding the parking in the front and the width of the loop. When Mr. Moffitt suggested a removal of a small portion of the retaining wall to limit the need for regrading and to provide for a reduced loop width, Ms. Merten said that removal of historic materials should be avoided. However, Ms. Merten noted that many portions of the wall are in disrepair and are going to have to be repaired anyway. She stated that the wall should be modified using the same material.

Ms. Merten stated that in keeping with the Secretary of Interior's Standards the Commission shouldn't issue a Certificate of Appropriateness without assessing all the character defining features of the property identified in the landmark ordinance. That said, both the retaining wall and the tree are identified as character defining features of the property that should be scrutinized intently before a Certificate of Appropriateness is issued. She felt this is a matter of balancing the goals of the applicant with the guidelines. She recommended that the loop to be one way from Charlotte Street to Chestnut Street, with the four parallel parking spaces on the one-way driveway, and not installing the loop to lessen impact on the site. In her opinion, enough off-street parking is available on Chestnut Street. Combined with the four parallel spaces, this should provide enough parking for clients and they could still enter the building from the front.

Mr. Siemens stated that he that he needed the loop because cars entering from Chestnut Street would need a way to exit. He pointed out that a car could be coming in from Charlotte Street and the four parallel spots might be full, and that the car would then need to circle out onto Chestnut Street to locate other parking.

Mr. Moffitt said that he is concerned with the width of the driveway near the Chestnut Street entrance since it is directly in front of the house. He asked if the stone retaining wall could potentially be modified to allow the entry driveway to be widened, and thus mitigating the need for the widened driveway right in front of the house. He suggested that one of the Commissioners more familiar with the wall might visit the site to assess whether that would be a possibility.

Regarding the front loop parking, Mr. Siemens said that he does not want clients to park in the grass, and that widening is necessary to allow for turning radius and parking along the driveway. He stated that none of the front parking will be visible from the street. Ms. Sudnik expressed her concern that additional grading and ground disturbance might affect any archaeological resources that may potentially be on the site.

It was the consensus of the Commission that there were no further concerns regarding the rear parking lot, as shown on the revised drawings.

Mr. George Stowe, architect, reviewed a revised design of the two-story accessory structure, noting it will be Phase II of the project, and asked for the Commission's support of a design as they move forward. He reviewed the location of the accessory structure in relationship to the house and the elevations of the accessory structure. Since the Commission's earlier review did not support the original design of the accessory structure for a number of reasons, he presented a revised design which was more compatible with the house, but still keeping some of the stucco or concrete surface on a portion of the house. However, after the informal meeting with Mr. Moffitt and Ms. Merten and hearing their concerns on the revised second design, he presented a third design to the Commission.

Mr. Moffitt explained his concerns of the second design. He stated that there were details that made the accessory structure look less congruous than a more contemporary design might. Mr. Moffitt stated that the new design that was presented to the Commission seemed more consistent in size, scale and character of the existing house.

Ms. Merten also noted that the second design still had the large concrete wall on the elevation facing Chestnut Street. She stated that it was her opinion that the third design was moving closer to meeting the Standards.

After the Commission discussed the accessory structure, their consensus was to support moving forward with the third design.

Chair Ross opened the public hearing at 5:23 p.m.

Mr. Jack Thompson, Executive Director of the Preservation Society of Asheville-Buncombe County, felt that the only reason the applicant is continuing with the project is being able to install the circular loop to provide for parking. The preservation easement set forth for the property by the Preservation Society will have protective covenants which are more restrictive in the nature of their protection of the property than the power of the Historic Resources Commission. He stated that they would be in favor of a slight alteration of the retaining wall to provide for widening the driveway. He felt the archaeology perspective is an irrelevant concern as they will have consultation with staff in the archaeological field from the Western Office of the N.C. Dept. of Cultural Resources on how best to mitigate ground disturbance.

Chair Ross closed the public hearing at 5:26 p.m.

Mr. Moffitt stated that he was in favor of the current direction as proposed in the third design of the accessory building. He stated that he would be in support of the loop if the width of the driveway could be lessened. He felt that modifying the driveway seemed like a reasonable option, and noted that it can always be reconstructed. He was not, however, comfortable with the two parallel spaces in the loop drive and requested a final presentation before a decision is made.

Mr. Nutter supported pursuing the possibility of the retaining wall modification.

Mr. Eakins supported the revised site plans with or without the retaining wall modification.

Mr. Fast was comfortable with the revised plan but if modification of the retaining wall will reduce the drive width, he would be in support. He noted that the applicant cannot count on the on-street parking as this is a major investment. He also did not think that the two parallel spaces on the loop were too invasive to the site.

Ms. Merten summarized that the Commission is comfortable in the modification to the retaining wall to reduce the width of the driveway at the section in front of the house, regardless of whether they could save the tree or not.

In response to Mr. Nutter, Ms. Merten said the next step is that the applicant will proceed to the Planning & Zoning Commission on September 2. It will then be scheduled for City Council consideration, and they will want to know if the Commission is recommending approval of project. After City Council, the project will come back to the Historic Resources Commission for final approval. She said the Commission could ask if the applicant would be willing to come back to their September meeting as the design moves forward. That would not affect the timing of City Council's consideration.

Urban Planner Jessica Bernstein said that she would be handling the conditional zoning application as this moves forward through the Planning & Zoning Commission and City Council. Since it is a conditional zoning application, City Council will be the body that approves any sort of deviation from the Unified Development Ordinance requirements, e.g., the landscaping plan. While City Council will make that ultimate approval on any modifications, they want to be sure that the Historic Resources Commission is supportive of that modification.

Mr. Nutter suggested the applicant come back to the Commission again so the Commission can present a clear recommendation to City Council. Ms. Merten agreed in that the applicant can move forward with the Planning & Zoning Commission on September 2, and then come back to the Commission at their

September meeting. Again, that would not affect the timing of City Council's consideration. Mr. Siemens was agreeable with returning back to the Commission's September meeting.

2. Certificate of Appropriateness - 23 Courtland Avenue - Amendment to Enclose Rear Porches on First and Second Floors Along Rear Elevation; Construction of Stair on East Elevation

Historic Preservation Specialist Alex Cole used site plans while she reviewed the following staff report:

Owner/Applicant:	Patrick McCarthy Construction, LLC/Mahan Kalpa Khalsa Trust
Subject Property:	23 Courtland Avenue
Hearing Date:	August 12, 2015
Historic District:	Montford
PIN:	9649.11-1820
Zoning District:	RS-8

Property Description: Early 20th-century two-story vernacular dwelling. Shingles over weatherboards, irregular mass, Montford brackets, brick foundation, simple detail. (R. S. Smith architect).

Certificate of Appropriateness Request: That the application is to amend CA 14-15547PZ for enclosure of proposed two-level porch addition. Installation of twenty three 12-lite wood casement windows on enclosed addition and two 12-lite and half-paneled wood doors, matching the existing windows and doors. Construction of two-level wood stair along east elevation with railings and posts to match existing house, as required to meet building code for egress, per attached and approved drawings and plans. **All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**

HRC Staff Concerns per the Applicable Guidelines & Submittal Requirements: Staff has no concerns.

The guidelines for Additions found on pages 88-89 and the guidelines for Porches, Entrances and Balconies found on pages 72-73 in the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District, adopted on April 14, 2010, and amended May 2015, were used to evaluate this request.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends approval of the request for the following reasons: (1) Addition is designed so as to be compatible with the existing building in height, massing, roof form and pitch; (2) Windows in addition will be similar to those in the original building in their proportion, spacing, and materials; (3) Addition is limited in size and scale and does not overpower the site or substantially alter the site's proportion of built area to green space; and (4) New entrances will be on side elevation and will be compatible with the existing structure, in terms of scale, details, materials and color.

Ms. Cole noted that while staff had initial concerns regarding the location of the proposed stairs, but that the stairs were required to meet building code. Staff agreed with the applicant that locating them on the east elevation as proposed was the best solution.

Ms. Helen McCarthy, applicant, provided the Commission with some revised drawings, maps and site plans. She showed how they want to enclose the two porches and explained the construction of the wood stairs (showing a picture of original stairs).

Chair Ross opened the public hearing at 5:44 p.m.

Mr. Richard Stiles, resident at 34 Courtland Avenue, supported the amendments to the structure at 23 Courtland Avenue.

Chair Ross closed the public hearing at 5:49 p.m.

ADOPTION OF FINDINGS OF FACT

Based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A - project description; Exhibit B – existing and proposed site plans; Exhibit C – existing and proposed floor plans; Exhibit D – existing and proposed elevations; Exhibit E – renderings of proposed enclosed porch; Exhibit F – photographs of subject property; Exhibit G - revised site plan; Exhibit H - additional photographs of subject property; Exhibit I - floor plan; Exhibit J - signed list of neighborhood support; Exhibit K - additional elevation drawings; and the Commission's actual inspection and review of subject property by all members, Mr. Nutter moved that this Commission adopt the following FINDINGS OF FACT:

1. That notice of public hearing on this application was published in the Asheville Citizen-Times on the 29th day of July, 2015, and that each owner of real property situated within two hundred feet of the subject property was notified of this hearing in the mail on the 29th day of July, 2015 as indicated by Exhibits (L) and (M).
2. That at this hearing the applicant and affected property owners were all given the opportunity to offer oral and documentary evidence as well as submit questions to each other, the Historic Resources Commission staff and Commission members.
3. That the application is to amend CA 14-15547PZ for enclosure of proposed two-level porch addition. Installation of twenty three 12-lite wood casement windows on enclosed addition and two 12-lite and half-paneled wood doors, matching the existing windows and doors. Construction of two-level wood stair along east elevation with railings and posts to match existing house, as required to meet building code for egress, per attached and approved drawings and plans. **All necessary permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**
4. That the guidelines for Additions found on pages 88-89 and the guidelines for Porches, Entrances and Balconies found on pages 72-73 in the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District, adopted on April 14, 2010, and amended May 2015, were used to evaluate this request.
5. This application does meet the design guidelines for the following reasons:
 - a. Addition is designed so as to be compatible with the existing building in height, massing, roof form and pitch.
 - b. Windows in addition will be similar to those in the original building in their proportion, spacing and materials.
 - c. Addition is limited in size and scale and does not overpower the site or substantially alter the site's proportion of built area to green space.
 - d. New entrances will be on side elevation and will be compatible with the existing structure, in terms of scale, details, materials and color.
6. That the action and improvements proposed in the application before us for a Certificate of Appropriateness are congruous with the special historic character of the Montford Historic District.

This motion was seconded by Mr. Eakins and carried unanimously.

Based upon the foregoing FINDING OF FACT and for the reasons set forth therein, Mr. Nutter moved that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. This motion was seconded by Mr. Eakins and carried unanimously.

At 5:55 p.m., Chair Ross announced a short recess.

3. **Certificate of Appropriateness - 19 Birch Street - Construction of Addition and Replacement of Garage Doors on Existing Accessory Garage**

Historic Preservation Specialist Alex Cole used site plans while she reviewed the following staff report:

Owner/Applicant: James Bound/Dan and Judi Foy
Subject Property: 19 Birch Street
Hearing Date: August 12, 2015
Historic District: Montford
PIN: 9639.93-8412
Zoning District: RS-8

Property Description: .131 acre vacant lot.

Certificate of Appropriateness Request: That the application is to construct a two-story, 2,564 sq. ft., single-family residence with stucco, fiber cement lap and cedar siding exterior, asphalt shingle roof, and stucco chimney with standing-seam metal cap. Front porch will be supported by stone veneer and tapered wood columns and will have a standing-seam metal roof. Cantilevered bump-out along west elevation will have standing-seam metal roof and cedar brackets. Windows will be black aluminum clad, SDL, 2/1, 3/1, or multi-lite casement and front door will be 3-lite wood paneled, per attached drawings and plans. **All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**

HRC Staff Concerns per the Applicable Guidelines & Submittal Requirements:

1. Staff has asked that the applicant submit specifications for rear doors.
2. Staff has concerns that the scale, massing, roof form, detail, window placement on the side elevation and fenestration are not compatible with other historic buildings in the district.
3. Staff has concerns that the detailing of the new structure is not consistent with its overall scheme and design.
4. Staff has concerns that the overall character of the adjacent streetscape will not be maintained.

The guidelines for New Construction – Primary Structures found on pages 92-93 in the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District, adopted on April 14, 2010, and amended May 2015, were used to evaluate this request.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends the HRC give feedback to the applicant regarding making revisions to meet the guidelines and that the application be continued to a later hearing.

Ms. Merten said that she informed the applicant that, especially when reviewing new construction, the Commission generally would request revisions be made necessitating more than one review. Ms. Cole stated that the architect for the project was unable to attend the hearing, and asked that the Commission give as much specific feedback as possible so that the contractor would be able to relay any concerns and suggestions.

Mr. James Bound, co-owner and general contractor for a residential builder in Asheville, said that the architect was unable to be at this meeting. He would relay any comments/concerns to the architect.

Ms. Stephenson said that at the Executive Committee's main concern was the style and orientation of the roof. She noted that a clipped-gable roof is mostly found on Craftsman-style houses that are typically one story with lower-pitched roofs. She noted that the window placement on the side elevations clearly relates more to the interior space than the exterior of the house, and did not seem consistent in design with the Montford District. She suggested the architect review the lack of uniformity of the windows.

Mr. Moffitt felt that the newly constructed house next door, also built by Mr. Bound, is much more consistent in its theme and appearance. He stated that he thought the design for the house contained some nice details, but that the overall design is not consistent with the historic district. He noted that the trim board separating the lap siding from the single siding more commonly is located along the sill of the windows or at the top of the windows, rather than intersecting them. Mr. Moffitt also stated that he was not in favor of the metal roof and the asphalt shingle roof being on one house, as that is also not consistent with the district. He then noted that the pitch of the roof is too severe and using the clipped gable should be relative to the overall proportion of the roof. He suggested that instead of a clipped roof, perhaps a hip roof might be more successful.

Mr. Carpenter suggested on the bump-out on the west elevation should be siding instead of cedar. Also suggested was a possible shed-roof over the bump-out instead of a gable.

Ms. Cole said that staff would be happy to meet again with the owner/applicant before this is reviewed again by the Commission to make sure any outstanding concerns are addressed.

Mr. Moffitt moved to continue this matter until the September 9, 2015, meeting. This motion was seconded by Mr. Eakins and carried unanimously.

Other Business

1. Castanea Building Local Landmark Application - Final Review

Historic Preservation Specialist Alex Cole said that the Executive Committee met in July to review the final application for the Castanea Building. She noted that they had the same concerns about the final application as they did on the preliminary application, and that the original documentation and argument for the special historic and cultural significance wasn't substantial enough based on the Landmark Committee comments and information presented. The applicant did work on developing the context of the commercial corridor development and also provided additional information about the architect. The case was not made that the architect was a master architect, nor was the commercial context developed in such a way that it made a strong case for meeting the necessary criteria.

Ms. Sybil Argintar, drafter of the application, asked for, and received clarification by Historic Resources Director Stacy Merten, regarding the review process. She provided the Commission with a handout, and then addressed why she considers the building to have special significance and integrity, noting that that the building meets three of the criteria regarding special significance.

Ms. Cole, along with Ms. Merten and Assistant City Attorney Jannice Ashley, responded to Mr. Nutter when he asked for clarification on the difference between designation of an historic building within a district and landmark designation. Ms. Cole stated that an individual building can be considered to be contributing to a National Register or Local Historic District but may not be listed individually as a significant building. A local landmark, on the other hand, can be considered to be contributing, individually listed on the National Register, and should also have special significance beyond those qualifications.

Ms. Argintar responded to Mr. Carpenter when he asked about architect William J. East and his other structures in Asheville, and referenced the list of his works included in the application.

Regarding whether or not the architect could be considered a master, Ms. Merten said there is no contextual information describing Mr. East at the time he lived and worked in Asheville comparing him to other architects or argument as to why Mr. East stands out as a master, which is typically part of meeting

that criterion for landmark designation. The State Historic Preservation Office also typically requires that contextual information be documented in a landmark designation.

Mr. Carpenter noted there are so many great features to this building but did not feel it quite meets the special significance necessary for landmark status.

All Commission members agreed that the Castanea Building is a wonderful building.

Mr. Moffitt moved that the Historic Resources Commission not recommend the Castanea Building move forward as a local historic landmark, as the building is not associated with an event that has contributed significantly to the history of Asheville or Buncombe County; the building does not embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period or method of construction; the building does not represent the work of a master; and the building does not possess the level of integrity necessary to be eligible for that designation. This motion was seconded by Ms. Stephenson and carried unanimously.

2. Comments from Commissions, Public and Staff

Historic Resource Director Stacy Merten (1) they are moving forward with a Gardening on the Green event on September 26, working with the Biltmore Village Merchants Association and the Smith-McDowell House (out of this teaming up, she expected the beginning of some discussion of possibly looking at the guidelines as pertains to the landscaping in Biltmore Village); (2) she is working with the Montford community on a plan for a sign at the garden on the property owned by the Historic Resources Commission at the corner of Montford and Waneta; (3) reminded the Commission of the Historic Resources Commission's retreat on September 2, 2015, at Stratford Towers from 1-5 p.m. with the agenda still being developed; (4) said that the final adoption of the Historic Preservation Master Plan is scheduled for City Council review on September 8, 2015; and (5) she is working with the Transportation Department staff to resolve the issues regarding the granite curbing at the intersection at Soco and Montford.

Mr. Eakins said that the Time Capsule Committee in the Parks & Recreation Department is meeting on August 13 and has received many public recommendations. He asked that if the Commission had any thoughts on what should be placed into the time capsule to please pass them along to him.

Chair Ross said that County Commissioner David Gantt had asked her to serve on a committee for their History Wall.

Adjournment

At 6:57 p.m., Mr. Moffitt moved to adjourn the meeting. This motion was seconded by Mr. Eakins and carried unanimously.